



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,647	11/07/2001	Bernd Mayer	IN-5505	7382

26922 7590 07/17/2002

BASF CORPORATION
ANNE GERRY SABOURIN
26701 TELEGRAPH ROAD
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034-2442

EXAMINER

NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

6

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

09/889,647

MAYER ET AL.

Examiner

Art Unit

Patrick D. Niland

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1714

1. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The instantly claimed component III requires the water to be substantially free of acrylate copolymers. However, acrylate copolymers may be one of the composition ingredients and the instant claims are directed to the composition which is a mixture of the claimed ingredients. It is therefore unclear how or if "substantially free from acrylate copolymers" limits the instant claims.

B. The instant claim 11 is directed to the coating composition. It is unclear how the situation of application further limits the composition.

C. Claim 3 recites "preparable". It would require undue experimentation to determine all of the preparation methods which will give the instantly claimed composition. "Prepared" is acceptable. The following are supporting decisions for rejecting "obtainable" and similar terms as indefinite.

1. Atlantic Thermoplastics Co. Inc. v Faytex Corp. 23 USPQ 2nd 1481 (1486).

In footnote 6, on page 1486, referring to *Cochrane v Badische Aniline and Soda Fabrik (BASF)*, 11 US 293, the court stated "...because artificial alizarine can take different forms, BASF's claim would be indefinite unless limited to the described process".

The claim referred to is

Art Unit: 1714

"Artificial alizarine produced from anthracene or its derivatives by either of the methods described herein or any other method producing a like result."

2. Ex parte Tanksley 26 USPQ 2nd 1389

"A claim is indefinite if undue experimentation is involved to determine boundaries of protection".

This rationale is applicable to polymers obtainable by a stated process because any variation in any parameter within the scope of the claimed process would change the polymer produced. One who made or used a polymer made by a process other than the process recited in the claim would have to produce polymers using all possible parameters within the scope of the claims (temperature, pressure, diluents, component ratios, feed ratios, etc.) and then extensively analyze each product, to determine if his polymer was obtainable by a process within the claimed process.

3. Purdue Research v Watson 1959 CD 124 (Dist Ct)
affirmed by CCPA 120 USPQ 521.

"Preparable by" was held to not particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

"When one has produced a composition of matter where it is not possible to define its characteristics which make

Art Unit: 1714

it inventive except by reference to the process by which it is produced, one is permitted to so claim the composition produced by the process referred to in the claims. When the composition is thus claimed in terms of the process of its preparation, the product cannot be defined in such a manner as to assert a monopoly on the product by whatever means produced.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 97/42247

Lettmann et al. as interpreted by US Pat. No. 6025031 Lettmann et al..

Lettmann et al. discloses the instantly claimed coating composition, methods of making the composition, and coatings made therefrom. See the entire document. As stated above, it is not seen that the recitation excluding acrylate copolymer of component III distinguishes over the prior

Art Unit: 1714

art since a composition is claimed and the composition requires acrylate copolymer. It is further expected that at some point the water of the prior art did not contain acrylate copolymer.

5. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 97/42247 Lettmann et al. as interpreted by US Pat. No. 6025031 Lettmann et al..

Lettmann et al. discloses the instantly claimed coating composition, methods of making the composition, and coatings made therefrom. See the entire document. As stated above, it is not seen that the recitation excluding acrylate copolymer of component III distinguishes over the prior art since a composition is claimed and the composition requires acrylate copolymer. It is further expected that at some point the water of the prior art did not contain acrylate copolymer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the instantly claimed combinations of ingredients in the compositions, methods of making, and coatings of Lettmann et al. because they are encompassed by the prior art and would have been expected to give compositions having the properties disclosed by Lettmann et al..

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Niland whose telephone number is (703) 308-3510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-5408.

Art Unit: 1714

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

pn

July 12, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Niland', is written over the printed name.

Patrick Niland
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714